



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

71
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/240,053 | 01/29/1999 | CLEMENT W. BOWMAN | PROGRID | 6857 |
| 22191 | 7590 | 08/28/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| GREENBERG-TRAURIG 1750 TYSONS BOULEVARD, 12TH FLOOR MCLEAN, VA 22102 | | | BLECK, CAROLYN M | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3626 | |

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/240,053 | BOWMAN, CLEMENT W. |
| | Examiner Carolyn M. Bleck | Art Unit 3626 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This communication is in response to the "response for a requirement of information" filed on 29 August 2005. Claims 1-21 are pending.

Requirement for Information Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.105

2. Applicant and the assignee of this application are required under 37 CFR 1.105 to provide the following information that the examiner has determined is reasonably necessary to the examination of this application.

3. Applicant has provided Exhibit B in the response filed on 29 August 2005. Applicant states Exhibit B is a brochure that was issued by a third party, KPMG Peat Marwick, to one or more prospective customers after May 1994 and prior to 1996. The pending application claims priority to application 08/418,152 filed on 20 March 1995.

The Examiner requests information as to when Exhibit B was published for purposes of determining whether it can be applied as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(a). The Examiner also requests information as to whether Mr. Clement Bowman was the sole inventor of the product discussed in Exhibit B or whether this product was created by Mr. Bowman in collaboration with KMPG as is described in Exhibit B.

4. In responding to those requirements that require copies of documents, where the document is a bound text or a single article over 50 pages, the requirement may be met by providing copies of those pages that provide the particular subject matter indicated in the requirement, or where such subject matter is not indicated, the subject matter found in applicant's disclosure.

5. The fee and certification requirements of 37 CFR 1.97 are waived for those documents submitted in reply to this requirement. This waiver extends only to those documents within the scope of this requirement under 37 CFR 1.105 that are included in the applicant's first complete communication responding to this requirement. Any supplemental replies subsequent to the first communication responding to this requirement and any information disclosures beyond the scope of this requirement under 37 CFR 1.105 are subject to the fee and certification requirements of 37 CFR 1.97.

6. The applicant is reminded that the reply to this requirement must be made with candor and good faith under 37 CFR 1.56. Where the applicant does not have or cannot readily obtain an item of required information, a statement that the item is unknown or cannot be readily obtained will be accepted as a complete reply to the requirement for that item.

7. This requirement is subject to the provisions of 37 CFR 1.134, 1.135 and 1.136 and has a shortened statutory period of 2 months. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In claim 1, the limitations of “establishing a first independent variable and a second independent variable...,” “establishing a series of performance criteria statements...,” and “scoring each of said performance criteria statements to produce a plurality of scores which reflect the applicability of said performance criteria statements to said specific intangible asset of interest” are not enabled. At pages 14-15 of the response filed on 17 November 2004, Applicant provides an example of the claimed process. Applicant states that the user of the invention establishes two independent variables. However, the Applicant does not provide any steps of how a user is to “establish variables” or determine whether two variables are independent. Applicant states that a user develops a

list of criteria that are appropriate. However, Applicant does not provide any steps as to how a user is to establish these criteria probative of the value of the first and second variables. Applicant's specification describes the step of "scoring each of said performance criteria statements" at page 10. "An evaluator... selects (e.g., by circling) for each of the criteria the one statement which best describes the organization or asset being evaluated." Applicant does not provide any steps or guidelines as to how a user is to score the performance criteria statements. For these reasons, claim 1 fails to satisfy the enablement requirement because the claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

10. Claims 2-20 are similarly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph based on their dependency to claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

11. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

12. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claimed invention as a whole must be useful and accomplish a practical application. That is, it must

produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result." State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373-74, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02.

The question of whether a claimed invention produces a concrete result arises when a result cannot be assured. In other words, the process must have a result that can be substantially repeatable or the process must substantially produce the same result again. *In re Swartz*, 232 F.3d 862, 864, 56 USPQ2d 1703, 1704 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (where asserted result produced by the claimed invention is "irreproducible" claim should be rejected under section 101). The opposite of "concrete" is unrepeatable or unpredictable.

Applicant's process recited in claim 1 fails to produce a concrete result because the process does not substantially produce the same results. Claim 1 recites "establishing a first independent variable and a second independent variable..." and "establishing a series of performance criteria statements...". At pages 14-15 of Applicant's response filed on 17 November 2004, Applicant provides an example of these steps based on Applicant's specification. These steps are performed by a user who establishes both the variables and the performance criteria. These steps fail to recite any objective means, steps or guidelines for how a user is to determine the independent variables and the performance criteria. Each time a user establishes the variables and performance criteria, different steps could be taken by the user. Furthermore, claim 1 recites "scoring each of said performance criteria statements to produce a plurality of scores which reflect the applicability of said performance criteria statements to said specific intangible asset of interest." Applicant's specification

describes this step at page 10. "An evaluator... selects (e.g., by circling) for each of the criteria the one statement which best describes the organization or asset being evaluated." This step of scoring does not provide any objective means or steps to score the performance criteria statements. Each time an evaluator "scores" the performance statements different steps could be taken. For these reasons, claim 1 will not produce the same result each time the process is repeated. Thus, while claim 1 produces a tangible and useful result, claim 1 fails to produce a concrete result.

Similar analysis is applied to claims 2-21.

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carolyn Bleck whose telephone number is (571) 272-6767. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8:00am – 5:30pm, and from 8:30am – 5:00pm on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached at (571) 272-6776.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

14. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 [Official communications]

(571) 273-8300 [After Final communications labeled "Box AF"]

(571) 273-6767 [Informal/ Draft communications, labeled
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Knox Building, Alexandria, VA.


JOSEPH THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

CB

August 18, 2006